UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,576	06/22/2000	Joshua A. Jacobs	BIG1P001	1303

22434   7590   10/07/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA   94704-0778

EXAMINER
TODD, GREGORY G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	3

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/602,576	JACOBS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory G Todd	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 June 2000</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> .	6) ☐ Other: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 04-01)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No. 3

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is a first office action in response to application filed, with the above serial

number, on 22 June 2000 in which claims 1-31 are presented for examination and

priority to provisional application 60/142,181 is claimed. Claims 1-31 are therefore

pending in the application.

Specification

2.   The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to

determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

specification.

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The

application number of the copending application is required.

        Appropriate correction is required.

4.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: There is no reference to a contextual describer.

5.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: There is no reference to an information layer.

Claim Objections

6.   Claim 24 objected to because of the following informalities: The word "acces" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

7.   Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "multiuser" is suggested to be replaced with --multi-user--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claim 1 recites the limitation "the extensible data model" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10.   Claim 5 recites the limitation "the same database" in line 28. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The use of contextual describers is unclear and indefinite as it is not defined in the disclosure to enable one skilled in the art to limit the claim.

12.   Claim 7 recites the limitation "the data model" in line 35. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. The information layer could refer to the information layer in claim 20 or the information layer in claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

15.   Claims 1-17 & 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Homestead.com (hereinafter "Homestead", Reference Cited U).

16.   As per Claim 1, Homestead discloses a software architecture for enabling multiple users to perform a plurality of tasks via a wide-area network, wherein Homestead discloses:

a plurality of applications (different applications) (at least pp. 7, 12, 51, 52);

a data schema for storing a plurality of data objects, the data schema having an extensible, underlying data model (at least pp. 49-50); and

an integrated platform for enabling each of the multiple users to perform at least one of the tasks by controlling interaction between two or more of the applications and the extensible data model (site manager) (at least pp. 7-9, 18).

17.   As per Claim 2.

wherein the integrated platform dynamically contextualizes each stage of a task with reference to a corresponding user (eg. user editing a page / adding elements) (at least pp. 18, 20, 51).

18.   As per Claim 3.

wherein the integrated platform creates a contextual task list for the corresponding user (at least pp. 51).

19.   As per Claim 4.

wherein a data object is associated with one or more contextual describers that further describe a task in which the data object will be used (element describers, eg. basic) (at least pp. 51).

20.   As per Claim 5.

wherein the platform allows a user and an application to extend the database in a user-specific way, thereby enabling the multiple users and the plurality of applications to use the same database (at least pp. 7, 40-41).

21.   As per Claim 6.

wherein the database can be extended dynamically without changing the underlying structure of the database (webware) (at least pp. 7, 37, 40).

22.   As per Claim 7.

wherein the data model has extensible attributes that can be used to add a previously undefined data attribute and wherein the extensible, underlying data model provides a standard way of representing the previously undefined data attribute (adding new elements) (at least pp. 40-41, 51).

23.   As per Claim 8.

further comprising a user interface that is uniform across the plurality of

applications (manager / editor with template) (at least pp. 16-18).

24.   As per Claim 9.

wherein additional services can be added using the plurality of applications (at

least pp. 11, 38).

25.   As per Claim 10.

wherein the integrated platform is used to create and maintain an online business

presence (at least pp. 48).

26.   As per Claim 11.

wherein the integrated platform is used to create and maintain a customer

relationship management application (chat, collaboration) (at least pp. 9, 11).

27.   As per Claim 12.

wherein the architecture is a reactive architecture which supports a plurality of

levels of task granularity and is dynamically aware of what information has been entered

by a user (eg. drag and drop) (at least pp. 2, 3).

28.   As per Claim 13, Homestead discloses an integrated software platform for

creating a user application having a user experience, wherein Homestead discloses:

a data model for arranging and configuring application data, wherein the

application data are one of a fixed attribute and an extended attribute (at least pp. 2-3,

7-8, 40);

a data logic component for operating on the data (at least pp. 7, 40-41);

a back-end code layer for managing the user experience (at least pp. 7, 40); and

a visual design component for implementing the user experience by presenting a

user interface for entering data into a computer system (webware for remote user

personalization using a uniform interface) (at least pp. 2, 3, 22).

29.   As per Claim 14.

further including an information architecture layer for modeling the user

experience (site manager, wysiwyg) (at least pp. 3, 18, 51).

30.   As per Claim 15.

wherein the user application is a multi-user, online application (at least pp. 7-8).

31.   As per Claim 16.

wherein the user application is a customer relationship management application

(chat, collaboration) (at least pp. 9, 11).

32.   As per Claim 17.

further including a data schema for storing data configured in the data model

(storage) (at least pp. 8, 49-50).

33.   As per Claim 19.

further including an interface layer for containing a plurality of HTML form

elements (at least pp. 18, 51).

34.   As per Claim 20.

further including an information layer, wherein the information layer and the back-

end code layer translate instructions from the information architecture layer (page

personalized and published) (at least pp. 7-8, 25-27).

35.   As per Claim 21, Homestead discloses a task-based architecture for building a

multi-user, online application by completing a plurality of tasks, wherein Homestead

discloses:

a data schema for storing data related to the online application (at least pp. 49-

50);

a data model for storing and sharing the data as the plurality of tasks is

completed (at least pp. 2-3, 7-8, 40);

a plurality of tools (at least pp. 8-9, 12);

a task viewer application for creating a user interface (at least pp. 18); and

a plurality of services for gathering and authoring the data (webware for remote

user personalization using a uniform interface) (at least pp. 2, 3, 22).

36.   As per Claim 22.

wherein the plurality of tools includes a data extension framework for defining

and extracting data (steps in managing site) (at least pp. 2-3, 7-8).

37.   As per Claim 23.

wherein the plurality of tools includes a context management tool for determining

a context in the user-oriented application development system (managing site) (at least

pp. 7-9, 18).

38.   As per Claim 24, Homestead discloses a system for building a distributed, multi-

application program, wherein Homestead discloses:

a plurality of tasks (new / view page) (at least pp. 18, 7-8);

one or more sequences within a task (editing in manager) (at least pp. 18, 7-9);

a plurality of data objects (elements) (at least pp. 8, 50); and

one or more panel objects within a sequence through which data related to the

multi-application program is entered and manipulated, wherein a panel object is aware

of which data object from the plurality of data objects to access to retrieve existing data

related to the multi-application program (managing elements for a single page within the

manager) (at least pp. 7-9, 18).

39.   As per Claim 25.

further comprising a plurality of model objects, a model object containing one or

more data objects and a logic component for operating on the one or more data objects

(site manager with elements) (at least pp. 7-9, 18, 50).

40.   As per Claim 26, Homestead discloses a method of building a customized Web

site, wherein Homestead discloses:

creating and maintaining one or more Web pages (at least pp. 7-8);

developing a communication service with users accessing the Web site (eg.

collaboration) (at least pp. 7, 9);

developing an online transaction system for processing online orders made

through the Web site (eg. marketplace, moneymakers) (at least pp. 9); and

creating a reporting service for generating reports relating to Web site activity,

wherein the method of building the customized Web site includes a task-based

approach to completing an activity and has a uniform user experience (eg. hit counter)

(at least pp. 8-9, 11).

41.   As per Claim 27.

further including creating and maintaining a catalog for describing one of one or

more products and one or more services (eg. collaboration, edited page) (at least pp. 9,

11, 17).

42.   As per Claim 28.

wherein the task-based approach further includes completing one or more

sequences, a sequence including one or more panels (eg. site manager) (at least pp.

14-18).

43.   As per Claim 29.

wherein creating and maintaining one or more Web pages further includes

controlling the appearance and content of a Web page (at least pp. 7-8).

44.   As per Claim 30.

wherein developing a communication service with users further includes

developing a user database according to user behavior patterns and preferences (eg.

guest book / counter) (at least pp. 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

45.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

46.   Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Homestead.com (hereinafter "Homestead", Reference Cited U).

47.   As per Claim 31.

Homestead does not explicitly disclose developing an online transaction system

for processing online orders further includes establishing an online account and

checkout process. However, OFFICIAL NOTICE is taken for using such a business

model as being well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homestead clearly discloses small businesses creating sites with their system (at least

pp. 31-32, 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a checkout process as e-

commerce is very well known to be used for a website.

48.   Claims 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Homestead.com (hereinafter "Homestead", Reference Cited U).

49.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Homestead.com (hereinafter "Homestead", Reference Cited U) in view of Norcott et al

(hereinafter "Norcott", 6,334,128).

50.   As per Claim 18.

Homestead fails to explicitly disclose the data schema being implemented as a

relational database. However, the use and advantages for using such a database is well

known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the

teachings of Norcott (at least col. 1, lines 13-21). As is inherent in Homestead to have

storage for users personalized pages in a database (at least pp. 50-51, 7-8),

Homestead does not indicate exactly what version of database is used. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to incorporate Norcott's relational database simply as an alternative for the web

storage of Homestead's users, as this allows some advantageous and some

disadvantageous features as compared to an object oriented databases, depending on

the particular nature and uses of the storage.

Conclusion

51.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Lagarde et al (distributed tasking), Sondur et al (relational database), Cohen

(ASP page application authoring), Graham (remote web-authoring methods), Wolfe et al

(website development details), and Belanger (remote server application execution) are

cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are

requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to

this office action.

52.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gregory G Todd whose telephone number is (703)305-

5343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-

3900.

Gregory Todd

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100